

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/672,190 09/28/00 F.

A

EXAMINER
----------

PM82/0620

LAW OFFICES OF ADAM H JACOBS  
PATENT ATTORNEY  
SUITE 726  
1904 FARNAM STREET  
OMAHA NE 68102

SWINEHART, F	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED:

06/20/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3617

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The subject matter of claims 11 and 12

2. Claims 4,5,11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is confusing in that it first sets forth a stern draft of substantially zero, and later sets forth such stern draft being no greater than 4% of the draft. Claim 4 is further of multiple sentence form.

Claims 11 and 12 as a whole are not understood. Furthermore, in claim 11, "the included exit angle", "the rearward undersurface" and "the lower corner" lacks antecedent basis in the claim(s).

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3617

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,158,369. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all of the limitations of the pending claims are set forth in the claims of the patent.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of copending Application No. 09/677,897. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are of the same scope.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mills.

Mills teaches the field of the invention, including a generally triangular hull having pointed bow and wide stern.

Re claim 3, Mills states the flat aft bottom is even with the water's surface, furthermore, such is characteristic of this type of hull.

Art Unit: 3617

Re claims 5-7, such is inherent with Mills, as his hull is shaped as claimed.

8. Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 3600 by facsimile transmission. The submission of such papers by facsimile transmission must comply with the notice published in the Official Gazette, **1096 OG 30** (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center number is (703)-305-7687.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed L. Swinehart whose telephone number is (703)-308-2566.

10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-1113.

June 17, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a trailing flourish.

**Ed L. Swinehart**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 3617**